

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 11-15, 18, 19, 30-32, 47, 49-50, 59-65, 67-69, 71-76 are pending in the application. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 20-29, 33-46, 48, 51-58, 66, and 70 are cancelled. Claims 15, 18, 19, 59, 62 and 71-74 are allowed. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 30-32, 47, 49, and 75 are amended. The amendments to the claims contained herein are fully supported by the application as filed and do not present new matter. The features of the amended claims were previously searched by the Examiner and no new search is necessary. Therefore, it is permissible to enter these amendments after final. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

ELECTION/RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's election of group I, with traverse. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's decision to withdraw the claims of group II and maintains that consideration of all of the claims of the application as filed will not place an undue burden on the Examiner. However, in order to expedite prosecution of this application Applicant now cancels the withdrawn claims.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND 103

Claims 1, 4, 5, 30, 32, 47, 49, 50, 60, 61, 63-65, 75 and 76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Togasaki (JP 04-352131). Claims 8 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Togasaki reference. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1, 5, 8, 30, and 47 are now amended to recite, in part and with reference to Figures 1 and 3 for exemplary purposes only as this invention includes numerous embodiments, a first substrate 111, a second substrate 112 opposing the first substrate, and a substrate extension portion 111T that is provided on the first substrate and extends beyond the second substrate so as to not oppose the second substrate. Electronic parts, such as driving IC 115, are mounted on the substrate extension portion.

In contrast, to amended Claims 1, 5, 8, 30, and 47, the Togasaki, et al. reference appears to disclose, with reference to Figure 1, a first substrate 1a and a second substrate 1b. The first substrate includes an electronic part 3. The portion of the first substrate 1a that the electronic part is mounted to is opposed by the second substrate 1b and does not extend beyond the second substrate 1b, as set forth in amended Claims 1, 5, 8, 30, and 47. The Togasaki et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest an electronic part mounted on a substrate extension portion, as set forth in amended Claims 1, 5, 8, 30, and 47.

Independent Claim 75 recites, in part and with reference to Figure 3 for exemplary purposes only, a holding member for an electro-optical device 120 having a liquid crystal panel supporting portion 121, an extension portion 122, and a recess 122a in the extension portion to receive an electronic part. The extension portion is thicker than the panel supporting portion.

In contrast to Claim 75, the Togasaki, et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest a holding member for an electro-optical substrate. The Togasaki, et al. reference appears to disclose, with reference to Figure 1, a first substrate 1a having an electronic

device 3 and a second substrate 1b having a recessed portion to receive the device 3. The second substrate 1b fails to disclose or suggest a liquid crystal panel supporting portion, an extension portion having a recess extending from the liquid crystal panel supporting portion, the extension portion being thicker than the panel portion, as set forth in Claim 75.

The Tagasaki, et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest each feature of amended Claims 1, 5, 8, 30, 47, and 75. Therefore, the Togasaki, et al. reference fails to anticipate or render obvious Claims 1, 5, 8, 30, 47, 75 and those claims dependent therefrom. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection of Claims 1, 5, 30, 47 and 75 and those claims dependent therefrom, as well as the Section 103 rejection of Claim 8 and those claims dependent therefrom.

ALLOWED SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant thanks the Examiner for recognizing the patentable subject matter of Claims 15, 18, 19, 59, 62 and 71-74 and for allowing these claims.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claim 31 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant thanks the Examiner for recognizing the patentable features of this claim. Applicant now writes Claim 31 in independent form to include all of the features of Claim 30. Therefore, Claim 31 is now in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Nov 29, 2004

By: 

G. Gregory Schwley, Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

BGS/les